Name of Standard: Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, object-oriented (FRBR-oo)
URL: https://www.ifla.org/publications/node/11240
Related Resources:
metadataregistry.org,
https://www.ifla.org/publications/functional-requirements-for-bibliographic-records,
http://www.cidoc-crm.org/,
https://www.ifla.org/publications/node/11412

Summary (1-2 sentences):
FRBR-oo is a conceptual model that combines FRBR, geared towards text, and CIDOC, a museum standard geared towards three-dimensional objects. What's great about it is that it is a generalized model for resource description, rather than a format-specific one. It accommodates archival description almost out of the box, including mechanisms for describing entities in structured ways sorely lacking from EAS now, such as data carriers and events. It is also linked-data ready.
The expectation is that following the release of the Library Reference Model (LRM), FRBR-oo will eventually be superseded by LRM-oo.

Discussion:

1. **Background (a few words)**
    a. **What kind of a standard is it? (Conceptual model, ontology, …)**
    FRBR-oo is a conceptual model that combines FRBR, geared towards text, and CIDOC, a museum standard geared towards three-dimensional objects. It includes a vocabulary published, with URI's, on metadataregistry.org.
    b. **Who maintains this standard?**
    International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA)
    c. **How old is it?**
    v.1.0 released 2010; v.2.4 released 2015 (latest). V.2 includes FRAD and FRSAD.
    d. **What is its stated purpose and scope?**
        i. harmonize library and museum conceptual models
        ii. verify the consistency of the FRBR models by expressing them differently
        iii. enable interoperability between library and museum data
        iv. improve both contributing models through the work of harmonizing them
        v. extend the scope of each contributing model to form a model for cultural heritage data

2. **Relation to Archival Description (1-2 sentences)**
    a. **expand on 1d**

FRBR-oo brings the work-expression-manifestation-item concept to physical objects. In terms of archival metadata, I find this especially relevant for two reasons:

i. because the description of archival resources as artifacts has been a bit of an afterthought in the current archival standards (there is no carrier entity, for example; rather, the physical description of a resource is treated like a property--the need to describe a physical medium frequently means the switch to non-contextual, item-level manuscript cataloging. Though I do believe RiC is addressing that gap.)

ii. because the description of archival resources as works or indeed anything other than mere items has been declared unnecessary or inapplicable based on the false premise that each resource

- is unpublished (wrong; any type of resource may benefit from the description of its context, i.e.archival description),
- has exactly one instantiation (wrong; think for example of different photographic prints made from the same negative, or indeed different reproductions altogether; or think of published resources embedded in the collection), or
- if, as is frequently the case, is an aggregate, would necessitate an overwhelming number of work records (wrong--the aggregation itself can (and should) be treated as a work).

b. If archival description is outside the stated purpose/scope, explain how it could be used for archival metadata

FRBR-oo doesn't explicitly address archives but could be used for archival description with very little modification in my opinion by hooking the WEMI structure into each aggregate level of description (series, subseries etc.), with the Work level representing the aggregation at the highest level.

3. **What it does well (1-2 sentences)**

FRBR-oo includes some crucial entities that are currently lacking from the EAS standards, notably entities for carriers, events, and containers (the latter via a workaround class "Type" (E55)). These entities facilitate the description of content separately from physical properties and allow the incorporation of structured administrative data (such as curatorial events (exhibits, loans, accessions, conservation action) and pre-acquisition data (custodial history, archaeological data (findspot, excavation) into one system).

4. **Shortcomings (1-2 sentences)**

Personally, I think it's lacking a dedicated container entity to allow for built-in container management without resorting to Type.

5. **Possible Impact on Structured Archival Data (2-5 sentences)**

There is a lot to be learned from FRBR-oo. For one, even though it is coming out of an ER model, it is well positioned for implementation as linked data. In fact, the relationships are already published as URIs. It is also modular enough to be built out without having to start over, unlike EAS (it would be fairly easy, for example, to add a container entity without disturbing the overall consistency of the model). It allows multiple lateral relationships (e.g. several works coming together in one expression and/or manifestation). It is granular enough to accommodate a number of different types of aggregations (Complex Work; Container Work; Aggregation Work; Serial Work). And it greatly improves FRBR by adding production layers to the WEMI structure in the form of Production Expression and Manifestation Product Type.